

THE C4 NEWSLETTER

Colonial Coin Collectors Club

Maris d/d Double Reverse



Fall, 1998

Volume 6 Number 3

COLONIAL COINS

A BOWERS AND MERENA SPECIALTY



Are you an active collector or dealer in colonial or early American coins? If so, being on the Bowers and Merena mailing list will bring you many benefits. Year in and year out, dating back decades, our auction catalogues, price lists, and other offerings have showcased some of the finest colonial and early American coins to be offered for auction or private sale. Just \$95 brings you all of our periodicals for the next 12 months, (issues *that cost us over \$200 to produce and mail to you*). Guarantee: if after receiving our publications for two months you are not completely delighted, let us know, your subscription will be refunded in full, and you can keep the publications you already have.

To order your subscription, call 1-800-222-5993 and ask for our Publications Department.

Or, are you thinking of selling? If so, let us showcase your colonial and early American coins in one of our Grand Format™ illustrated coin catalogues, personally prepared by Q. David Bowers and other staff numismatists who over the years have presented some of the finest properties ever to be sold—including the Eliasberg, Garrett, and Norweb collections, and many more.

Your call (1-800-458-4646) or note to Dave Bowers, Ray Merena (company president), or John Pack (auction director) will bring you instant consignment information. This may be the best financial decision you have ever made.

BOWERS AND MERENA

P.O. Box 1224 • Wolfeboro, NH 03894 • In NH: 569-5095 • FAX: 603-569-5319
www.bowersandmerena.com • email: bowersmerena@conknet.com

The C4 Newsletter Volume 6 Number 3
A quarterly publication of
The Colonial Coin Collectors Club, Inc.

C4 National Officers:

President: Dennis Wierzb

71234.3347 @compuserve.com

Treasurer: Angel Pietri

73562.3131 @compuserve.com

Secretary: John Lorenzo

Membership questions, address changes, and dues should be sent to Angel Pietri at the address listed above. Dues are \$20-regular, \$10 for junior members (under 18), \$25-1st class mailing of newsletter. \$400 for Life Membership (or 4 quarterly payments of \$100).



C4 Newsletter Associate Editors:

Angel Pietri, Russell Easterbrooks, Tom Madigan

*Articles, letters for publication, and ads should be sent to either
Angel Pietri, Russell Easterbrooks*

*Tom Madigan
or to your Regional Vice President.*

Fall, 1998

Librarian: Steve Tanenbaum

Compuserve Representatives:

Neil Rothschild 74776,375

C4 Regional Vice Presidents:

Region 1 (New England, Quebec, Canadian Maritimes)

Jim Skalbe, Colonial Trading Co.

Region 2 (NY, NJ, PA, MD, DE, DC)

Ray Williams

raydianewilliams@juno.com

Region 3 (VA, WV, NC, SC, GA, FL, AL, MS, LA, TN, AR, PR)

Stan Stephens

email: ses@wvnxaxa.wvnet.edu

Region 4 (OH, IN, IL, MI, WI, KY, IA, ND, SD, MN, KS, MO,

NE, Ontario, Manitoba)

Dan J. Freidus

Region 5 (OK, TX, NM, AZ, ID, WY, CO, MT, UT, NV, Mexico)
Mary Sauvain

Region 6 (CA, HI)
Jim Goudge

Region 7 (OR, WA, BC)
Rob Retz

Classified Ads

Ads for this newsletter can be purchased as follows:

	1 issue	2 issues	3 issues	Copy size
1 page	\$50	\$75	\$125	4-1/2"x 7-1/2"
½ page	30	45	75	4-1/2"x 3-3/4"

If you want to include a photo with your ad at an additional \$10. Black and white photo needed, size can be adjusted to fit. Please send check with your ad. We can accept camera ready copy or any Microsoft Word compatible computer file.

All members also have the right to include a free classified ad in the newsletter of up to 13 lines.



Table of Contents

Editor’s Notes and Message from the President	4
<i>Angel Pietri</i>	
C4 Items for Sale	5
Convention Schedule	7
Letters to the Editor	8
Double “d” reverse- My favorite New Jersey copper	12
<i>Buell Ish</i>	
The Mott token revisited	25
<i>Angel Pietri</i>	
1786 Nova Constellatio Census	43
<i>Tony Carlotto</i>	
Unclassified Ads	47



Editor’s Notes and Message from the President

Angel Pietri

Welcome to the fall, 1998 and pre-convention issue of the newsletter.

As many of you know, Dennis has been very busy lately. He just recently changed jobs, and had to move to Boston. After commuting back and forth between Boston and New Jersey for a couple of months, he has just moved his whole family to Massachusetts. Though convenient for his convention plans, life has been quite hectic for him, so I am filling in for him.

Plans for the convention are coming along well, and we should all have a great and educational time there. There will be another auction by McCawley and Grellman, and a nice series of lectures. For details, look ahead. We look forward to seeing a good number of you there.



**THE COPPER COINS OF
VERMONT
AND
THOSE BEARING THE VERMONT NAME**
by Tony Carlotto

232 PAGES, WITH 283 PHOTOS
PLUS FOUR PLATES WITH 78 PHOTOS
BONDED LEATHER COVERS
NEW RARITY CHART
NOT JUST AN ATTRIBUTION GUIDE
CHAPTERS INCLUDE
COLLECTING BY TYPE
HOW WERE VERMONT COINS USED?
HISTORY OF THE MINT AND RELATED LEGISLATION
LEGENDS, DESIGNS, AND DEVICES ON THE COINS
THE MINT BUILDING AND LOCATION
THE MACHIN'S CONNECTION
EARLY VERMONT HISTORY
DIES, PLANCHETS, OVERSTRIKES
COIN PLATES USE BOTH SIDES OF SAME
SPECIMEN IN MOST CASES
AUCTION CATALOGUES OF VERMONT INTEREST
VERMONT COPPER LITERATURE

Regular edition price \$50 (add \$3 for shipping)
By special order, Deluxe Hardbound Leather edition
with enlarged photo plates of all varieties \$235

Send orders to:

John Lorenzo



C4 Items for Sale

C4 Convention Items for Sale

Silver Second Convention Medals \$10

Copper Second Convention Medals \$3

Hardbound Scott Barnes Catalogs \$50

Add \$1 postage and handling for Medals and \$3 for catalogues. All will be sent uninsured at buyer's risk. If you want insurance, add an appropriate amount. Please forward your check to Dennis, payable to C4, at the address below.

The Richard Picker Collection Lot Envelopes

As mentioned in a recent issue of this newsletter, Stack's has provided C4 with Picker's own customized envelopes from his collection sold in October, 1984. They are available from the club for \$5 each if you can show adequate proof that you own the coin. This \$5 donation is for the club's treasury, thanks to Stack's. All unsold envelopes will be returned to Stack's. If you own any of these coins and would like to own the envelope, contact me at the address below.

Dennis Wierzba



Hogge Money

For anyone interested in these Summer Island coins, the Bermuda Monetary Authority has issued a limited edition book entitled The Coins of Bermuda. It contains quite a bit of information on these coins, including listings of most of the known specimens.

The cost of the book is \$40 postpaid while supplies last.

You can order the book from them at:

The Bermuda Monetary Authority
Burnaby House
26 Burnaby Street
Hamilton HM 11, Bermuda



Fourth Annual Convention, Nov. 19-22, 1998

If you have not made plans to attend our upcoming convention, do so now!

Our fourth convention returns to the Radisson Hotel in Boston, Ma., in conjunction with the Bay State Show. The hotel is located at 200 Stuart Street. Phone number: 1-617-482-1800.

For those arriving Thursday Nov. 19, there will be a reception that evening. Check for the location and time when you arrive at the hotel. The bourse will not be open except for dealer setup, but some of us will be around.

Besides the auction on Saturday night, there will be a series of lectures, again organized by Jim Rosen. The schedule is as follows:

Friday Evening

5:00-7:00	Sixth New Jersey Symposium Dennis Wierzba and Ray Williams
7:10-7:50	Voce Populi Coinage Stan Stephens
7:55-8:35	St. Patrick's Coinage John Griffiee
8:40-9:20	Overview of Washington Coinage Dave Menchell and Angel Pietri
9:25-10:05	Coin Manufacturing in Colonial Times

Fall, 1998

10:10-10:50 Dan Freidus
Fugio Coppers
Dave Palmer and Rob Retz

Saturday

10:00-10:50 Collecting Colonials for the Beginner
Don Mituzas
11:00-11:50 Coinage that Circulated in Colonial America
Phil Mossman



Letters to the Editor

The Colonial Economy- Commentaries

Your article on Edwin Perkins' book, *The Economy of Colonial America*, was very timely. I've been wondering when someone else would find the time and read this book, since it seems to go against everything we've been taught about the colonial economy.

Perkins makes the point that the American colonies really weren't suffering from a shortage of coins. The complaints that we can read in the newspapers of the times, about how little money is around and how hard it is to get any, Perkins characterizes as simply the grumbling typical of the age.

Elsewhere in his book he makes an observation that, perhaps, can reconcile our traditional understanding of the colonial economy with his newer view. Speaking of Spain, which enjoyed control of the fabulously rich silver mines of Mexico and Peru, Perkins notes that, despite all the silver Spain had mined for nearly 100 years, the country "...contained virtually no gold or silver coins at the end of the sixteenth century." Where did they all go? Perkins answers by saying that the silver mined in the New World went to pay Spanish debts to foreign merchants and governments and to finance her interminable European wars.

Perkins also notes that, although Great Britain had the Royal Mint and struck silver and gold coins, British newspapers were also full of complaints about a shortage of coins. Presumably, Britain's silver and gold also went to pay for foreign debts and military adventures.

Spain's answer to the money shortage at home was to strike a copper coinage, and Perkins writes that "...the volume was large enough to accommodate the domestic demand for money." Britain's answer for her American colonies was to allow them to overvalue the silver in circulation, as well as to turn a blind eye, so to speak, to the ever growing colonial reliance on the expedient of paper money.

Great Britain never got around to satisfying colonial needs for a copper coinage until it was too late. The 1773 Virginia halfpennies were ordered long before they finally arrived in the colony, and by that time Virginia had decided to cast her fortune with the new American republic. Even at home, Britain was reluctant to strike coppers for the masses. It is said that George III felt it was undignified to have the royal portrait appear on a base metal coin!

It appears that Perkins is right in saying that the American colonies did have a supply of silver coins, after all, and that the supply was adequate for most foreign exchange needs. The supply wasn't great enough to match the needs of war, however, and the later loans from Holland and France were vital to America's ultimate success in the Revolutionary War. It also appears that the traditional view of the colonial economy is right in saying that the colonies were cash poor, since silver didn't hang around long enough and was too high denomination for the common marketplace trade.

There was a strong need for the coppers struck by Vermont, Connecticut, New Jersey, and even Massachusetts (at first). Those were the coins the average fellow could have used when he bought something at a fair or a general store. What killed coppers as a medium in 1789 wasn't the poor quality of the coins, they'd always been pretty crummy. It was the oversupply, there were simply too many around and their market values crashed due to overabundance.

Fall, 1998

Yours truly,
Michael Hodder

I very much enjoyed Angel Pietri's thought provoking review of Edwin Perkins book; "The Economy of Colonial America" featured in the last C-4 Newsletter.

The colonial economy is a vast and complex topic. I think most would agree that on the average, the colonial economy sustained vibrant growth prior to the post Revolutionary period. However, the recognized value of a medium of exchange in sufficient quantities to stimulate this economy is where questions arise.

English and foreign coins, paper money, bills of credit, and state coins all had roles in this economy. These and the most used medium of exchange, 'commodity money' all suffered the same fate, the lack of a universal recognized value. Despite the confusion over what a given medium of exchange was worth at any given time, the colonial economy flourished! In part this can be attributed to the valuable agricultural production, and incredible natural resources, harvested through out the colonies.

Foreign and some state coins circulated widely, and though coin shortages did exist, the colonist clamoring for coins was surely a cry for a recognized valued coin, namely English coins.

The colonist clearly used what ever medium of exchange was at hand, determined an agreed on value and purchased the goods and services they needed, thus stimulating the economy

More information is needed as with most colonial subjects, all of which makes this time in our history so interesting.

Russell Easterbrooks

Editor's comments:

Both letters make good points. I guess the question is, like in the debate over paper money, what was necessary and what was simply convenient. And regardless of which one you feel is right, the colonial coinage is still historically important.

Perkins' point is that the economy did not really suffer prior to the Revolution as a result of a lack of medium of exchange. As Russell mentions, the colonists resorted to any available medium to meet their needs, whether bills of exchange, counterfeit coins, or cut silver pieces as examples. And credit probably played a major role in handling both large and small transactions. The laws of the day made giving credit to customers easy. There was a major safeguard for the creditors. Unlike today, when failure to pay debts simply gets you a bad rating and maybe some obnoxious collection agency on your back, in colonial times failure to pay debts landed you in jail no matter how famous or prominent you were (i.e. Robert Morris). I would say this was probably a pretty good incentive for people to pay their bills.

Michael's point about the war years is very true. Once the Revolution started, economic chaos ensued. The supply of silver dried up substantially due to hoarding and limitations in trade due to the now enemy British fleet. The ensuing economic depression was to last until 1792, clearly encompassing the period of the state coppers. Even the Copper Panic has to be viewed within this context. An over-abundance of copper pieces in an otherwise solid economy would not have presented the same problem as it did in 1789, when the US economy was very weak.



Credit where credit is due- On Grapevines in Connecticut Coppers

In the January, 1996 issue of The Colonial Newsletter (CNL 101) a short article of mine was published on grapevines on the reverse

Fall, 1998

shield of Connecticut coppers. In that article I mentioned that very little had been previously published on this aspect of these coppers. Recently, while paging through some 50 year old issues of The Numismatist, I found a short note on the topic that I had not seen before. It was in the April, 1948 issue (LXI(4): 223-224), by John M. Richardson (Stratford, CT), and entitled "Grapevines in Connecticut copper coins". Mr. Richardson, in his article, starts to examine the vines in the reverse shields and presents a preliminary discussion and listing of these shields: no device (my Type B), the typical I vine over two (my types A & C), and the exceptional 1787 reverse F with two vines over one (my type D). Mr. Richardson's work seems to not have been followed up on, until my article. My apologies to Mr. Richardson for not finding his work previously, and giving him credit earlier for originally showing interest in the topic.

Frank Steimle



Double "d"- My Favorite New Jersey Copper

by Buell Ish

The Third C4 show in Boston (11/97) gave me the second opportunity in one year to add a certain NJ copper error coin to my collection. Offered at Tony Terranova's table was a double reverse coin that I had bid on when it was auctioned by Stack's as lot #981 in their June '97 sale (X-Saccone Collection sale lot #1811. Bowers & Merena 11/89) (Fig. 1). As Stacks does not allow mail previewing, my bid was not strong enough to buy the coin. Luckily for me Tony bought the coin for inventory.

In person, the coin was intriguing. I bought it after scrutinizing it with maximum care. Let's face it, when one encounters a double heads or tails coin, one's initial thoughts are suspicious. From showing this coin to collectors, I've learned how universal this response is. After a quick glance at both sides, the typical collector embarks on a detailed scrutiny of the rims. An unquenchable desire

Rare Maris Reverse d/d Error

Probably High Rarity-7



- 1611 [1787] Maris reverse d/reverse d. Flip double struck. Rarity-7+. 153.1 grains. VF-30/30. Dark olive brown, with lighter brown high points. Old marks in the horizontal lines of the shield on both sides; minor planchet cutter clip above RI on one. **Rare New Jersey error**, the New Jersey series was much better struck than the Connecticut, for example, and spectacular errors such as this are infrequently encountered. The horizontal and vertical shield lines on both sides are clear and distinct, and the letters in the legend are similarly well defined. Although accorded a high Rarity-7 status, this may be conservative, as we are unfamiliar with another such major reverse d error.


From the state of the reverse die, this piece was struck after the reverse had been married to 16-d, and is contemporary with the early strikes of M 43-d, M 44-d, and M 45-d. At 153.1 grains the weight is high for an M 45-d (average 146.7 grains in the present writer's data base) or an M 44-d (average 144.9 grains); while it is in range for the recorded weights of M 43-d. The diameter range of M 43-d presently recorded is 26.7 to 27.2mm; accordingly, the flan of this piece must have expanded following its flip striking.

Overall, this piece is somewhat reminiscent of the 1785 Vermont Ryder-4 obverse/obverse we offered in our sale of the Ezra Cole Collection, Lot 1159; and the 1786 Vermont Ryder-6 obverse/obverse we sold in our sale of the Norweb Collection, Lot 1270.

As noted, major errors in the New Jersey series are rarely encountered. The most recent seen was Oechsner:1284, a flip double struck off center 43-d in EF condition which sold for \$1,870. Spiro:1547 was an overstruck M 46-e brockage; while Spiro:1630 was a group lot containing brockages of reverses e, i, and t. Spiro:1631 was an interesting error, a reverse U with a blank "obverse."

Fig. 1: Description of d/d double reverse coin in Bowers & Merena's Saccone Collection sale, 11/89.

Side
A



Side
B



Fig. 2: d/d double reverse coin, side A (first strike reverse) and side B (second strike reverse). Arrows point to areas of side A where edge of shield from side B can be appreciated.

to “ring” the coin soon follows. But all the characteristics of a genuine New Jersey copper are there. At this point Joe collector begins puzzling: “if not a fake, then how could this have been made at one of the NJ mints?” The answer to the puzzle, is reached by clues provided by the coin itself.

Like many coins, the story of how this coin was made is written on it. I had previously put together in my mind a striking sequence that would produce the coin. Seeing the coin in person made me quite certain that just such a process had produced it (Fig. 2). One side is exactly like the “d” reverse with the protruding shield as seen on the common Maris 43-d. This side appears more worn because the shield protrudes further on this side. I have concluded that this side of the coin was formed by the second strike: I will refer to this side as Side B for this reason. The other side shows the same die (Note the characteristic die break at K4 on the shield’s perimeter. This side is somewhat dished. This side was formed during the first strike and then deformed during the second strike: I will refer to this side as Side A. With this piece the strike order designations A and B seem a good choice because there is no obverse and two reverses. What really impressed me when I saw the coin in person was how, from side A, I could make out the shape of the shield on side B. This is most evident in the vertical shield lines about ¼ inch up from the bottom. Here one sees a slight line sloping down about 20 degrees from left to right. This feature combined with the radial expansion I will cover below is, to me, the proof of authenticity.

These features would be very difficult to produce other than by striking. An electrotype, a cast copy, a coin struck with two reverse dies, and a coin fabricated from two real coins would all tend to have a full protruding “d” shield of similar size on both sides. Only a genuine flip over double struck coin would look like this coin. Also interesting to me was that the rotation is such that whatever side one looks at, the bottom point of the shield on the other side is under the L”.

From conversations with fellow collectors, I knew there was little knowledge about how a double reverse coin could be struck with the

Fall, 1998

same die on each side and have no trace of an obverse. I decided to test my theory by requesting the Gallery Mint to follow a proposed striking sequence and send me the results for examination. The results convinced me that there might be general interest among colonial coin collectors in this topic.

I contacted Adam Hardcastle, the Chief Coiner at the Gallery Mint. Initially he indicated that he thought it would take two reverse dies to make a coin such as I was describing. But the more I described how I thought it could be done, the more interested he became. By the end of our phone conversation, I could tell he was excited to give it a try.

I mailed him my order, a few diagrams, and photocopies of the two auction appearances of my coin. I called about a week later and he informed me that the results were already on their way to me. He said he even made a set for the Gallery Mint to keep because he wanted to write an article on the same topic for *Error Scope*, the CONECA newsletter. Adam said, "Your theory was correct. That is the only way the coin could have been made." His opinion was that it had to have been done intentionally.

I disagree slightly in that I don't think the method described below is the only possible striking sequence to yield this coin. I do, however, think this is the fewest planchets, fewest strikes method to produce such a coin. I also feel it is not possible to know if the coin was produced intentionally or accidentally. Adam did say that both sets he made involved the upper planchet sticking in the upper die, something that normally does not happen. This increases in my mind the likelihood that the coin was made accidentally. If one planchet sticks in the hammer die as it goes up, there is the possibility that it could come unstuck from one side first and turn over before landing on the lower planchet. If this occurred then the next strike would complete the process. According to Adam, the dies at the Gallery Mint separate at least 4 inches between strikes. This seems far enough for a falling coin to turn over. I don't know if the original presses used to strike New Jerseys had a similar "open" height.

Side
A



Side
B



Fig. 3: Gallery Mint's g/g double reverse, side A (first strike reverse) and side B (second strike reverse). Arrows on side A point to shadow of outline of shield from other side produced by dishing as coin is struck the second time.



Fig. 4: Gallery Mint's 51g copy coin (coin #2), showing backwards and incused reverse.

Here is how I asked the Gallery Mint to make the coin:

FIRST STRIKE

Insert two planchets, strike once. This should yield two coins, each nearly blank on one side. One will have a reverse die impression on one side, the other an obverse.

SECOND STRIKE

Same two planchets. Obverse coin from first strike stays in obverse die, reverse coin from first strike flips over such that shield created in first strike is against blank side of other planchet (orientation important)*.

Strike again.

RESULTING TWO COINS:

1. This coin will have two reverses. The first strike reverse will get a little flattened against the planchet plugging the obverse die. The reason for this flattening is primarily the flow of metal required to fill the shield during the second strike. Actually flattening is not a good word as the height of the devices does not appear to change, rather the coin becomes a bit dished because the center sinks to fill the shield on the opposite side (Fig. 3).
 2. This coin will have a mostly normal obverse (even though it was struck twice), but an incuse, backward-reading reverse such as with a brockage. This reverse is formed as the rev, shield from the first strike sinks into this planchet (Fig. 4)
- *I asked Adam to reproduce the rotation as seen on my original coin (just over 90 degrees).

Actually Adam Hardcastle informed me that he used the obverse die as the hammer die. This is why this coin shows doubling, because it was not perfectly aligned for second strike. Which die is the hammer die is a consideration only when it comes to speculating about the accidental vs. intentional question. From mailing drafts of this article to several knowledgeable individuals for their assistance and from showing the coin to other collectors, I have essentially taken an

Fall, 1998

informal poll. The majority think the coin was more likely intentionally made rather than accidentally struck. One persons opinion was that to happen accidentally would be a one in a million occurrence. If this is correct then, arguably, there might be three produced in New Jersey's authorized mintage of 3 million. I am of the opinion that this question is bound to remain unanswerable.

Another error item that I had the Gallery Mint make for me using the same pair of dies (Maris 51-g copy), was a reverse brockage. This pair of coins is made in the following manner. First, a regular coin is struck. Second, leaving that coin sitting in the obverse die, a new planchet is inserted between it and the reverse die. The second strike takes place. The second planchet bears a reverse image on both sides, but one of them is wrong-reading and incuse because it was created by the first coin acting as a die. I mention this pair of coins at this point, because in studying them I realized something that I have since learned is not a surprise to those who know brockages. The two right-reading shields were significantly different in size. This was very noticeable to the naked eye. This made me wonder why I was not seeing a similar thing on the flip over double reverse coins.

I figured out how to measure the shields to study this. My method was to protect the coins in a mylar flip, and then lay digital calipers on top of them while under a stereo microscope. I concentrated on measuring shield heights. This was more easily done for the Gallery Mint pieces because of the crisp features an uncirculated coin possesses. The old coin was a significant eye test, and for that reason I also took measurements across the B pales.

What I learned was that for some reason the flip over double struck coins had expanded considerably less than the brockage. I am still trying to think through why this is the case. I am very interested in theories and/or information as to why this is the case. I expected the d/d coin to have expanded less than the G.M.M. duplicates. This is because I thought that the G.M.M.'s press probably exerted more force than an original New Jersey mint press would have. In the end,

my best measurements have the d/d coin expanding slightly more than the G.M.M. pieces.

The table below shows my measurements and the calculated expansion as a percentage. While the G.M.M. brockage expanded almost 11%, the G.M.M. flip over double strikes expanded only approximately 2.5%. At this same end of the spectrum is the original d/d coin at approximately 3.5% expansion.

Table "A". Expansion rates

ITEM	FEATURE	SIDE B	SIDE A	PERCENT CHANGE
d/d double reverse	Shield Height	.856 inches	.884 inches	+3.27%
did double reverse	Width Across Pales	.423 inches	.439 inches	+3.78%
G.M.M. brockage	Shield Height	.738 inches	.818 inches	+10.84%
G.M.M. Double Reverse #1	Shield Height	.738 inches	.758 inches	+2.71%
G.M.M. Double Reverse #2	Shield Height	.738 inches	.785 inches	+2.30%

This noted expansion verifies some of my early conclusions. Also it clearly supports my conclusion as to which side was produced during the first strike. It is the shield produced by the first strike that expands during the second strike. The shield produced in the second strike is the size of the die. The .738 inch measurements above are both proof of this as well as my realization that I was spending time measuring essentially the same thing in all three G.M.M. coins.

The table above lists two G.M.M. double reverse coins. I had asked that additionally they make me a pair of planchets receiving just the first strike. I ended up with two sets with both strikes due to a misunderstanding of my instructions. I then had them make the pair of planchets as I had wanted. Insert two planchets strike once. This

Fall, 1998

pair is interesting to study. The two “blank” sides show ghost images. Actually both planchets show both a shield and a horse if one looks at them in the right light and exercises a little imagination.

I am currently aware of the following other double reverse or obverse coins:

New Jersey

Maris 82. Maris gave this coin a unique number. Variety 82 has now been deleted because later researchers determined it a Maris 36 error coin. In his 1881 book Maris wrote, “A small head and only part of the plow and legend can be seen. *Both sides appear to have been struck from the same die.*” Maris gave the coin no reverse designation. This coin was referred to as 82-hh when it was sold in the Garrett sale (Bowers & Ruddy 10/80) as lot 1486. This informative lot description reads in part, “Richard Picker and the cataloguer both have come to the same conclusion and feel that after the first normal striking the coin flipped over in the dies and was struck again after a blank planchet was introduced between the dies.”

Vermont

Ryder-4. Ezra Cole (Bowers & Merena 1/86), lot #1159. In addition to being a double obverse piece, this coin shows an incuse impression of the reverse. The lot description is also quite informative.

Ryder-6/Ryder-8 muling. Norweb (Bowers & Merena 10/87), lot #1270. This coin is quite a different item as it is a muling of two obverse dies rather than a flip over double strike.

Two other double obverse Vermonts are plated on page 179 of Ken Bressett’s monograph: “Vermont Copper Coinage”. Studies on Money in Early America, ANS 1976.

In ‘The Early Coins of America’ by Sylvester S. Crosby, 1875, Crosby writes on page 187, “Another feature, rarely seen, is, that some pieces are found bearing upon both sides of a *solid* planchet, impressions from the same die: this is probably caused by the coin

last struck becoming by some means turned over upon the planchet next to be struck; thus the planchet would protect it from one die, becoming itself incused, while the other die would impress the other side of the planchet upon which it had before acted.”

A physical process that makes this coin possible is known as “work hardening”. Copper, like most metals, gets harder when formed. This is why a struck coin rings, because it is harder than a planchet. If a coin is in a fire it becomes annealed (soft) and no longer rings. This is also why coins had to be annealed before overstriking. Work hardening can be easily demonstrated with a coat hanger. Note how easy it is to bend a straight section, but how nearly impossible it is to straighten out the twisted segments. Make a tight bend. Now try and straighten it. It works the same with copper wire. This is because work hardening has made the formed area harder. Work hardening is why, during the second strike described above, the shield from the first strike sinks into the softer copper of the planchet plugging the obverse die. This shield represents a hard crust on the surface of a soft interior. The interior of the planchet has been worked less and is therefore not as worked hardened.

To learn more about the properties of copper, I purchased two publications from the Copper Development Association (800-232-3282 or www.copper.org). The two books I have are part of the seven volume set of Standards Handbooks. They contain physical and mechanical properties of the most common wrought copper, copper alloys, and cast copper. The copper (copper content greater than 99.3%) section lists properties for 69 different compositions. I have chosen a representative copper to quote data on for the purposes of this article. I don’t know the composition of my coin and suspect that the composition of New Jersey coppers varies anyway due to eighteenth century technology. The copper I chose has physical properties that represent an approximate average of all the coppers listed. Yield strength varies from 10 k.s.i. to 50 k.s.i. for this copper. Yield strength is defined as the maximum stress that can be applied without permanent deformation of the test specimen. In other words, fully annealed copper is permanently deformed at stress levels above 10,000 pounds per square inch. Quarter hard copper

Fall, 1998

yields at 30,000 pounds per square inch, half hard at 36,000 p.s.i., full hard at 45,000 p.s.i., and spring hardness yields at 50,000 p.s.i.. These numbers are different for alloys of copper and other elements, but the principles illustrated are the same.

Striking a coin work hardens it. A future research project would be to determine how hard copper gets during the minting process. It seems reasonable to me that a struck coin could be at least quarter hard, so I will use quarter hard in the example that follows. Exactly how hard is much less important than that it is harder than a planchet is to start with.

During the first strike we have two planchets. The sides against the dies are deformed and work hardening takes place. The outer layers of the coins bearing the image of the dies have hardened. The interior of each coin and the surfaces touching each other deformed little and have properties similar to fully annealed copper. Now the coin with the shield on it flips over and the shield rests against the still soft surface of the other planchet. During the second strike, the shield (yield strength 30,000 p.s.i.) sinks easily into the blank planchet surface (yield strength 10,000 p.s.i.) quite simply because it is three times as strong. As copper flows to fill the shield formed during this second strike the coin acquires its slightly dished shape. The individual details of the shield from the first strike are deformed, but not really flattened in this process. They look different primarily because the shape of the underlying material has changed a little.

Conclusion

The New Jersey d/d double reverse coin is a genuine specimen. It was produced most likely by the simultaneous introduction of two planchets into the coin press, with the piece bearing the reverse impression flipping over before a second strike. Whether it was minted accidentally or purposefully we may never know.

Editor's Note: As to Buell's question about why the double reverse expands less than the brockage, I offer the following possible

explanation. The dishing produced on side A by the second strike is produced by the downward flow of metal as the planchet fills the reverse shield depression on the die and forms the shield in side B. This downward force significantly blunts the expansion (sideways) force exerted by the second coin's flat surface as it strikes the shield on side A, diminishing the degree of expansion. In the case of the brockage, the opposing (non-shield side in this case) side on the first coin does not cause any dishing on the shield as it is struck a second time since no further metal flow will occur on the already formed devices of the non-shield side. Therefore, the side of the coin serving as the die for the brockage will sustain the full expansion force of the second strike, with significantly more expansion resulting compared to the double reverse case.



The Mott Token Revisited

by Angel Pietri

Last year in this newsletter we ran an article debating the time of origin of the Mott token. As you may recall, there are two versions about the token. One states that the token is of very early origin near its date of 1789. The other states that it is most likely from the Hard Times token era, possible commemorating an anniversary of the firm.

In that issue, I promised to do some research into this issue, and this has revealed some very interesting data which, though not clearly establishing the time of origin, runs counter to some of the long held beliefs about the token.

History

At least since 1859, the token in question has been attributed to William and John Mott of 240 Water Street. In the book The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909 by I.N. Phelps Stokes, vol. 5, p. 1234, under 1789, he quotes the following:

Fall, 1998

*In this year, the jewelry firm of William and John Mott, 240 Water St., issued a business "token" resembling a coin, the first to be issued by the merchants of New York--- Bushnell, An Historical Account of the First Three Business Tokens Issued in the City of New York (1859), 8 *Man. Com.* (1859), 596-598, with illustrations on page 597. Similar tokens were issued by other firms in 1794, 1795, and later years.--- Ibid.*

(Man. Com. Refers to the Manual of Corporations of the City of New York for 1859 by D.T. Valentine).

With this entry, it seems, numismatic myth is born, only to be further enriched in future years.

Further Developments

After many decades of being simply referred to as a 1789 token by the "jewelry firm" of William and John Mott, there appeared a reference to a supposed Mott token struck over a 1837-39 large cent. This, in addition to the resemblance of the eagle on the token to the one by John Reich which appeared on the US Mint gold \$5 and \$10 pieces since 1807, led to the conclusion by some that the token was an anniversary token for the 50th year of the firm issued during the Hard Times token era. Russell Rulau, in his book Standard Catalogue of United States Tokens, 1700-1900, subsequently states, "...it would be futile to resist the evidence, we concur" with the new interpretation.

Nevertheless, many collectors and numismatists remain unconvinced with this "evidence", and still classify the Mott token as an early American token. They base their belief mostly on the date on the token, its probable British manufacture (presence of plain and ornamented edges), and the coarse fabric of the token. The Hard Times tokens generally exhibit much superior workmanship to the Mott token. However, an argument has been made that some of the HTT's from the Troy, NY area do show a similar coarse manufacture.

No one to my knowledge has questioned whether William and John Mott actually issued the tokens.

After that article was published last year, I proceeded to study many of the “facts” mentioned above. Though I cannot yet place a date of issue on the token, I came up with some interesting information that directly challenges some of the long held assumptions about the token.

Following, I will analyze some of these aspects.

The Mott token overstruck on a large cent of the 1837-1839 time

I will be very brief on this one. Very simply, way too much weight has been put on a piece that very few people have seen, or that any expert has authenticated. A rumor I heard says that the large cent details on this piece are incused rather than raised.

This, like the very existence of this piece, is however just that, a rumor. Until such time as this piece is authenticated, I can put no weight on it. The owner of the piece, if it exists, should produce it for such authentication.

The eagle design

The eagle design on the token’s reverse does look very similar to the eagle design by John Reich on the US Mint gold pieces of 1807 on. Does this mean that the token designer copied John Reich? In my opinion, it does not. This type of stylistic comparison is very difficult to uphold without much more evidence to back it up. Artistic styles have been and will be always copied. In my opinion, chances are about equal that either Reich copied the Mott token, or that they both copied someone else. Furthermore, such a belief (that Reich was the originator of the design) would require two assumptions. First, it assumes that the eagle and shield design on the US seal is an original design. Second, it would also have to assume that the maker of the token only had other coins to copy and was not exposed to the rest of the art world at his time. Neither of these assumptions would be correct.



FIG. 460.—Phoenix.



FIG. 451.—Eagle displayed.



FIG. 452.—Eagle displayed with wings inverted.

Fig. 1: Phoenix

Fig. 2: Displayed eagle

Both obtained from A Complete Guide to Heraldry



Fig. 3: Seal of the City of Nuremberg ca. 1500

Fall, 1998

The use of the eagle in heraldry goes back to Greek times. Even early depictions of the mythical phoenix rising from the ashes used an eagle design to portray the phoenix (Fig. 1). The type of eagle on the Mott token and the gold pieces is called a “displayed eagle”, and can be used with outstretched wings, or with the so-called inverted wings (Fig. 2). Multiple examples of both exist since the Middle Ages. The displayed eagle with the shield on its breast also dates back at least several hundred years to the seal of the city of Nuremberg in the 1500’s (Fig. 3).

What about the use of the more dynamic eagle portrayed in the gold coins and the token? Compared to the more rigid examples shown above, these eagles show a more lifelike, aggressive-defensive look. I have located an anti-Jefferson political poster titled “The Providential Detection” dating to ca. 1797-1800 (Fig. 4). It depicts a displayed eagle (with wings inverted) defending the constitution which shows the same aggressive-defensive posture as the one on the token. This could have just as easily been a model for the token maker.

In summary, I cannot definitely conclude that the token maker did not imitate Reich. However, the opposite conclusion is also very tenuous.

Lack of address on the token

What does this mean? Though hardly conclusive evidence, the lack of address points to a relatively early time of issue. We have to look at the history of the growth of New York City and its merchant tokens to analyze this.

In 1789, NYC was not that large a city, and was exceeded by Boston and Philadelphia in relative size and importance. However, this was not to last long. By 1800, it had surpassed both in size and importance, becoming the largest and fastest growing city and the entry point for most immigrants to America. Figure 5 shows the boundaries of the city at different times from 1808 to 1862. I have highlighted the boundaries for 1808 and 1840. As can be seen, the




Fig. 5: Limits of the Built-up Area of Manhattan 1808-1862

Table 12: Population Growth on Manhattan Island, 1790-1865*

Wards	Date of format'n of the ward	1790	1800	1810	1814	1820	1825	1830	1835	1840	1845	1850	1855	1860	1865
First.....	4,320	7,941	7,630	12,085	9,929	11,331	10,380	10,629	12,230	19,754	13,486	17,373	9,852
Second.....	5,167	8,493	7,439	8,214	9,315	8,203	7,549	6,394	6,962	6,665	3,249	2,507	1,194
Third.....	6,449	7,426	7,495	9,201	10,801	9,599	10,884	11,581	11,900	10,355	7,909	3,757	3,367
Fourth.....	6,935	10,226	9,856	10,736	12,240	12,705	11,439	15,770	21,000	23,250	22,895	21,994	17,352
Fifth.....	9,148	14,744	14,523	12,421	15,093	17,722	18,495	19,159	20,362	22,686	21,617	22,337	18,205
Sixth.....	13,076	11,286	11,821	13,309	20,061	13,570	14,827	17,198	19,343	24,698	25,562	26,696	19,754
Seventh.....	1791	15,394	12,120	10,886	13,006	14,091	15,873	21,481	22,982	25,556	32,690	34,422	39,982	36,962
Eighth.....	1803	9,128	10,702	13,766	24,285	20,729	28,570	29,073	30,900	34,612	34,052	39,406	30,098
Ninth.....	1803	4,719	4,343	11,162	10,956	17,333	20,618	24,795	30,907	40,657	39,982	44,385	38,504
Tenth.....	1808	10,890	10,824	17,806	23,932	16,438	20,929	29,026	20,993	23,316	26,378	29,004	31,537
Eleventh.....	1825	7,344	14,918	26,845	17,053	27,259	43,758	52,979	59,571	58,953
Twelfth.....	1827	7,938	11,808	24,437	11,652	13,378	10,451	17,656	27,958	28,259
Thirteenth.....	1827	12,598	17,130	18,517	22,411	28,246	26,597	32,917	26,368
Fourteenth.....	1827	14,288	17,306	20,235	21,103	25,196	24,754	28,080	23,382
Fifteenth.....	1832	13,202	17,755	19,422	22,564	24,046	27,587	25,572
Sixteenth.....	1836	22,723	40,350	52,882	39,823	45,176	41,972
Seventeenth.....	1837	18,619	27,147	43,766	59,548	72,953	79,563
Eighteenth.....	1846	31,546	39,415	57,462	47,613
Nineteenth.....	1850	18,465	17,866	28,252	39,945
Twentieth.....	1851	47,055	67,519	61,884
Twenty-first.....	1853	27,914	49,017	38,669
Twenty-second.....	1853	22,605	61,725	47,361
Total.....		33,131	60,489	96,373	95,515	123,706	166,086	197,112	268,089	312,710	371,223	515,547	629,810	805,358	726,386

*In this table one can see the statistical results of some great fluctuations in the population of those wards in which the necessities of commerce and its warehouses supplanted large masses of inhabitants. For example, in the first six wards, which comprised the whole region south of Canal Street, these fluctuations began to be felt as early as 1845, and the effect became more marked in each succeeding census period. In all the wards south of Fourteenth Street, the encroachment of warehouses and factories produced many changes in the state of the population, concentration being the most important.

Source: Second Annual Report of the Metropolitan Board of Health, 1867, New York State, *Assembly Documents*, IX, No. 122 (1868), 146.

Fig. 6: Census figures for Manhattan Island, 1790-1865

city more than doubled in geographic size during this period of time. In 1793, the urban area did not reach more than 2/3 to 4/5 of the way to Canal Street. Even more impressive are the population census figures for the city (Fig. 6). The population grew from 33,131 in 1790 to 312,710 in 1840, growing by 30,000 or better each decade from 1800 on. The number of listings in the New York directory also showed an impressive growth according to a directory ad in 1808 (Fig. 7) from 4,250 names in 1790 to 14,350 names in the 1808-9 directory.

If we look at the HTT's from NYC, very few of the ones issued in large cent size, with the exclusion of counterstamps, are lacking an address. In addition, the Wolfe, Clark & Spies token of the late 1820's shows a very interesting feature. When reissued, not only was the order of the names changed, but also an address was added. The answer I think lies in the above NYC size and population data. In a small city of 30,000-60,000 inhabitants, an address was less necessary, since most people in the city would be familiar with the majority of commercial establishments. But as the city grew into the cosmopolitan center it already was in the 1830-40's, an advertising token without address made less and less sense. Therefore I feel that the demographic information of NYC favor a date of issue much closer to 1800 than to 1840.

The Troy, NY HT tokens

Can we compare the Troy area tokens with the NYC tokens. I guess we could but with a major caveat. There was very little similarity between the two cities, even if we could call the Troy of the 1830's a city. A review of the population data of Troy reveals that during the times in question it was a small town composed predominantly of blue-collar workers. In 1790, it was merely a village of 1,802 inhabitants. The census of 1810 counted 3,895, and Troy would not exceed 4,000 inhabitants until 1815. By 1824, this number was up to over 8,000. It would not exceed 30,000 subjects until the 1850's, and according to Carole Turbin in 1860 only 12,018 of over 39,000 inhabitants were males over 15 years of age. The majority of the population and the workers were women and children.

THE NEW-YORK DIRECTORY CONTAINED,		
In 1790,	about	4250 names
1791,		
1792,	about	5698
1793,		6438
1794 & '95,		
1796-7, or 21st year Amer. Inde.		7904
1797-8,	22nd do.	9126
1798-9,	23rd do.	9113
1799-0,	24th do.	9934
1800-1,	25th do.	10,200
1801-2,	26th do.	
1802-3,	27th do.	12,012
1803-4,	28th do.	
1804-5,	29th do.	11,319
1805-6,	30th do.	11,844
1806-7,	31st do.	13,536
1807-8,	32nd do.	13,776
1808-9,	33rd do.	14,350

Fig. 7: The New York Directory: Number of listings

Therefore, if Troy in 1840 were to be compared with NYC in any way, it would be with the NYC of 1790 at best. Apples and oranges!

William and John Mott

As I mentioned above, nobody has challenged Bushnell's notion that these two gentlemen issued the Mott token. Let's examine that.

William and John Mott were among the first merchants to be listed in the NYC directories. They were listed from 1787 until 1824, when it seems that John Mott may have died. Subsequently, William is listed for a few more years. The 1830-31 directory has a listing for Ann Mott, widow of John, following the entry for William Mott of Pearl Street, now listed as Mott & Co. In the following year, neither William of Pearl Street or William & Co. is listed. Rather, a new entry for William & John Mott (not the first John's son, since John had no offspring's), **grocers**, appears located at 154 Fifteenth and Avenue 7th. However, it is unclear whether this is the same William Mott.

Were William & John Mott really jewelers? We already see a possible indication to the contrary in the preceding paragraph. An analysis of the other directory entries and known advertisements also casts doubt on this assertion by Bushnell. In the 1787 directory (Fig. 8), William & John Mott are listed as grocers (see above paragraph). The copy from this directory, obtained from the American Antiquarian Society (Joe Levine's directories, which he was kind enough to let me use, started in 1785, but skipped to 1789) has the M cut off, and it appears from the copy that the original directory's page is cut off. Nevertheless, the start of the M listings is evidenced 9 lines above. They were not listed in 1785, so either 1786 or this entry is their first directory appearance. From 1789 on, they are listed as "merchants". The only ad I have been able to locate in reference to their business is an indirect mention in an ad that appeared in "The Daily Advertiser", April 28, 1800. This is an ad by Thomas Carr, an English merchant recently established in Norwalk, Connecticut, specializing in dying and finishing cloth (Fig. 9). He lists William & John Mott as his agents in NYC. Not conclusive, but

M

Evers Charles, merchant, 14. Water-street
 Ellis Robert, Rationer, 18, do.
 Eller Benjamin, tobacconist, 20, do.
 Erton William, printer, 22, do.
 Eller George, grocer, corner Wall and Water-streets
 Errier William, light-office, 26, do.
 Cormick Andrew, 35, do.
 Esterton David, shop, 49, do.
 Ott John and William, grocers, 81, do. ←
 Murray Joseph, grocer, 83, do.
 Mulheron Richard, woollen and linen-draper, 87, do.
 Ott Samuel, grocer, 89, do.

Fig. 8: The NY Directory 1787 listing for William & John Mott (opposite page- letter from Marie E. Lamoreux, Assistant Director of Reference Services at the American Antiquarian Society)


[1939] DYER & FULLER.—To the Gentlemen and Ladies of the city of New York and its Vicinity. Thomas Carr, Lately from England, respectfully begs leave to inform his friends and the public in general, that he has taken a Fulling Mill, and all other conveniences well calculated for dying and finishing cloths in every description, at Norwalk, Connecticut. . . . He dies the best blues upon woollen, linen, cotton, and silks: scarlet, upon woollen, and all other colours, according to pattern, upon woollen, silk, and cotton. All kinds of damaged goods cleaned, dyed and finished with neatness and dispatch; all kinds of gentlemen's cloth cleaned and dyed; camel hair shawls cleaned and callendered. . . . N.B. Goods of the above description will be carefully received at William and John Motts, No 24 Water-street, New York, and duly returned when finished.—*The Daily Advertiser*, April 28, 1800.

Fig. 9: Ad by Thomas Carr- The Daily Advertiser



185 SALISBURY STREET
WORCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS 01609-1834

February 12, 1998

Angel O. Pietri


Dear Mr. Pietri:

Your inquiry of January 3, 1998, was referred to me. The American Antiquarian Society, a national learned society founded in 1812 to encourage and facilitate the study of American history and culture, maintains excellent genealogical and local history collections. We do not circulate any material outside the library because much of it is unique and irreplaceable. However, we do welcome qualified readers to use the Society's collections for their research.

Unfortunately I did not find any information pertaining to John, Jordan and William Mott in our genealogical references. I also checked our collection of published Mott genealogies and New York history without success. According to the New York City Directory for 1787, John and William Mott of 81 Water St., were grocers. A copy of the pertinent page is enclosed.

Staff time for research is limited and we are unable to respond to complicated or lengthy requests. Listed below is the name of a researcher. I suggest that you also direct your inquiry to the New York Genealogical and Biographical Society, 122 E. 58th St., Manhattan, New York 10022, whose collections focus on New York history.

Thank you for your check #1953. I hope this information is helpful and I wish you success with your research.

Sincerely Yours,

Marie E. Lamoureux
Marie E. Lamoureux
Assistant Director of
Reference Services

Paul Uek


TELEPHONES
ALL DEPARTMENTS: (508) 755-5221
RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION DEPARTMENT: (508) 752-5813

Fall, 1998

cloth dying and finishing is hardly the type of practice you would expect jewelers to be involved with. But a key piece of evidence is found in a listing of watchmakers that appears in the 1800 trade directory part (Fig. 10). William & John Mott are not listed. It would seem that they were simply grocers who expanded into the general merchandise business, but not watchmakers or jewelers. Welcome Jordan Mott!!!

Who was Jordan Mott?

Jordan Mott was the 8th of 11 children born to Samuel Coles Mott, a tanner by trade, and Mary Leonard. He was born on February 6, 1768. He married Lavinia Striker, 14 years younger than him, and had 7 children, the first one, John Hopper, born in 1805. Three of his children, James Stryker, Jordan Jr., and Jacob Hopper, went on to be watchmakers also.

It is unclear exactly when he started his business in NYC, but he is first listed in the NYC directory in 1796. He is not listed in the 1797, 1800 or 1801 directories. During 1797-1801 he was apparently associated with the firm of Mitchell & Mott at 247 Pearl St., but appears under a separate listing as a watchmaker by himself at 104 Gold Street in 1798 and near the Alms House (Chamber Street) in 1799. He is again listed by himself at 39 Frankfort Street for the 1802-3 period. In 1804, he joins cabinetmaker Jacob Morrell at 247 Pearl Street as Mott & Morrell. Morrell died sometime in 1808, with his widow listed in the 1809 directory. He is subsequently listed every year by himself until 1831, when the listing changes to J.S. (presumably James Stryker Mott) & J. Mott. In 1835, they apparently split. Jordan is now listed as J. & Jordan Mott, Jr., and James S. is listed separately, but only for one year. What happened to James S. after 1836 is unclear, but he is known to have died in an insane asylum in 1867. Presumably he was either incapacitated early or estranged from his father, since when Jordan Mott Sr. died in 1840, he left son Samuel Coles (3rd son and younger than James S.) as administrator of his estate.

WATCH-MAKERS.

Bessonett John P. 34 Maiden lane
 Demilt Thomas, 156 Water
 Dobbs Henry M. 149 Pearl
 Field John, 208 Greenwich
 Forbes Collin $\frac{V}{P}$ G. 90 Broadway
 Gemmell Matt. 259 Broadway
 Griffen Henry, 318 Water
 Griffen and Whitney, 318 Water
 Hawkshurst Nathaniel, 227 Pearl
 Kumbel William, 312 Pearl
 M'Hinch Robert, 63 Maiden lane
 Massey Edward, 103 Pearl
 Milne Robert, 212 Water
 Mitchell and Mott, 247 Pearl
 Mitchell Henry, 248 Pearl
 Mott Jordon, near the Alms-house
 Schuyler Peter C. 23 William
 Singleton and Young, 294 Water
 Slam William, Bedlow
 Southworth Elijah, 135 Broadway
 Stuart and Lay, 108 Water
 Tiebout Alexander, 28 Gold
 Warner George I. 70 Maiden lane
 Warner and Schuyler, 70 Maiden lane
 Whitney Afa, 27 Roosevelt

Fig. 10: 1800 Trade Directory of New York- Watch-makers

[554] MITCHELL AND MOTT.—Five Dollars Reward, Lost, yesterday morning, a Gold Block Chrystal Seal, with 3 sides, the impression a cypher, I. G. a wild man and a head. Apply to Mitchell and Mott, Watch makers, 247 Pearl Street.—*New-York Daily Advertiser*, October 3, 1797.

Jordan Mott (late the firm of Mott & Morrell), Clock & Watch Maker, 247 Pearl Street, (between Beekman and Burling Slips), New York. Warranted Clocks & Watches. Gold and Silver work on the lowest terms.

Line-engraving. Ornamental border. -Cream paper. Dated 1812 on reverse.

(See Mott & Morrell.)

Mott & Morrell (late of the firm of Mitchell & Mott), Clock & Watch Makers, 247 Pearl Street, (between Beekman and Burling Slips), New York. Warranted Clocks & Watches. Gold and Silver work on the lowest terms.

Line-engraving, signed by P. Maverick. Ornamental border. Cream paper.

This firm is listed at the above address in the New York Directories, 1804-09. Jordan Mott was born Feb. 6, 1768, son of Isaac and Anne Coles Mott; died in Bloomingdale, N. Y., Jan. 8, 1840. Listed in the New York Directories, 1802-38. (See E. D. Harris, *Descendants of Adam Mott*, 1906, p. 4; *New York Evening Post*, Jan. 10, 1840.) Jacob Morrell, cabinet-maker, is listed in the New York Directories, 1800-08. Presumably died in 1808 as his widow is listed in 1809. (For Peter Maverick, see entry under William H. C. Riggs.)

JORDAN MOTT,

(of the late firm of MOTT & MORRELL)

at his store, No. 247 Pearl Street.

Has on hand an extensive assortment of CLOCKS,
GOLD and SILVER WATCHES, JEWELLERY and
SILVER WARE.

From the 1810 Directory

Fig. 11: Ads by Jordan Mott

As to advertisement records, I was able to find four ads listing Jordan Mott as watchmaker (Fig. 11), one from 1797 by Mitchell & Mott, an undated line engraving by Mott & Morrell, one in the 1810 directory after the death of Jacob Morrell, and a line engraving dated 1812 by Jordan Mott. The wording of the ad in the 1810 directory in particular resembles the wording on the token's reverse.

All considered, I feel that Jordan Mott has a much better claim to the token than William & John Mott.

What is the meaning of the 1789 date?

I do not feel we can assume that 1789 was the date of original issue of the token, though it is a possibility. However, it does represent a very important date in the life of Jordan Mott. According to the trade rules of the day and the apprenticeship system, it was customary for tradesmen not to be allowed to establish themselves in business without the supervision of a master until they reached 21 years of age. Having been born in 1768, it was in 1789 when Jordan Mott achieved this independence that all apprentice tradesmen yearned for. This seems to me a better explanation for the date than all that have been proposed so far.

When was the token first issued?

Very simply put, we do not know. From the above demographic data and the discussions on the texture of the token, I favor an early date, before the mid 1820's. In his early years, Jordan Mott seems to have moved around quite a bit. Therefore, a token without address also makes sense for this reason. Several important dates come to mind as possibilities. It seems that 1789 was his start as an independent tradesman. 1796 represents his first listing in the directory of NYC. 1802 brought his apparent separation from Mitchell. And 1809 brought about his separation from Jacob Morrell, with the appearance shortly after of a very similarly worded ad in the directory. However, none of these times are backed by any other solid evidence to date the token. Taking into account the abundance of specimens, and the extensive die progression seen in

Fall, 1998

them, it also seems possible that the token was struck and restruck for quite a number of years. However, I feel that its categorization as a HTT, or as a 50th year anniversary piece is without foundation.

Conclusion

The Mott token was issued by Jordan Mott, the watchmaker, and not by William & John Mott, the general merchants. Bushnell was wrong. Though the exact date of issue is uncertain, I feel the evidence available suggests an early date, not the HTT era. And the date 1789 probably refers to Jordan Mott's independence from the apprentice system.

Therefore, I feel that the Mott token should remain in the early American token section, but we still do not know, and may never know if it is really the first American merchant token.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank several people and entities for their cooperation. Joseph Levine of Presidential Coin and Antique Company, Inc. was kind enough to allow me to search through his microfiche copies of the New York merchant directories. I would also like to thank the research staff's of the American Antiquarian Society, The New York Genealogical and Biographical Society, The New York Historical Society, and the New York Public Library, all of whom provided some key pieces of information for this paper. Last but not least, I need to thank John J. Ford, Jr. for providing some of the stimulus needed to write this, and for continuously providing me with books and references of numismatic interest.

Source of the ads listed

- Longworth's New York Directory 1800
- The Arts and Crafts in New York, 1777-1799: Advertisements and News Items from New York City Newspapers. Rita Susswein Gottesman. The New York Historical Society. New York, 1954.

- The Arts and Crafts in New York, 1800-1804: Advertisements and News Items from New York City Newspapers. Rita Susswein Gottesman. The New York Historical Society. New York, 1954.
- American Watch Papers... With a Descriptive List of the Collection in the American Antiquarian Society. Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society at the Annual Meeting Held in Worcester, October 17, 1951.

Other References

- Beer's Almanack- For Troy , NY Census figures.
- Ernst, Robert: Immigrant Life in New York City. Ira J. Friedman, Inc. Port Washington, NY, 1965 reprint
- Fox-Davis, Arthur C.: A Complete Guide to Heraldry. Bracken Books, London, 1993.
- Mott, Jordan L.: Mott Street. Gateway Press, Baltimore, 1986.
- Turbin, Carole: Working Women in Collar City: Gender, Class & Community in Troy, NY. U. of Illinois Press, 1992.
- Walkowitz, Daniel J.: Worker City, Company Town. U. of Illinois Press, 1978.



1786 Nova Constellatio Census

by Tony Carlotto

The following are the specimens of the 1786 Nova Constellatio I have been able to identify. They are listed in random order, not by condition. If anyone is aware of another specimen not listed, please notify me so I can include it.

ANS SPECIMEN- Nice coin with US a little weak. Plated in Breen p.119, and ANS Confederation Period p.96. Some light denticle-like markings on reverse between O and N of NOVA that appear like a rub and not an impression. Finest known. US very strong.

GARRETT #1- 115.3 grains, listed as fine, could be VF. Garrett I, 11/79 lot 617 @, \$6500. No clip apparent. US visible.

GARRETT #2- 114.7 grains, listed as Good-4, fine for wear, lot 618 @ \$1100. Clip above C in CONSTELLATIO and maybe *denticle-like mark above left of O in same*. Half of U shows and is almost full but faint.

T.CARLOTTO- 117.2 grains, from Rinaldo-Ringo. Clip between O of CONSTELLATIO and N of NOVA. *Denticle-like marks just right of A in JUSTITIA*. Date very weak and US weak. Some areas VF-XF. A bit of a cutters lip above TITI of JUSTITIA. At least ten instances of denticle-like marks on obverse. Graded by PCGS as 1783. US visible but not sharp. Not previously plated.

BOWERS & RUDDY, 12/75- Lot 231, VF, planchet voids K-5 obverse. Brassy areas appearing on both sides indicate smelting problem. Cataloger claims to have seen two others with this problem. Overall an upper level coin. US visible.

ERIC NEWMAN- Straight clips K-2-4 and K-8-10 that are longer than usual. JUSTITIA full and sharpest, LIBERTAS full, CON and final O of COSTELLATIO weak, NOV shows with A weak. US not visible, date full with 86 stronger, decent surface, half of wreath stronger than rest which shows, four groups of rays and six stars show. Fine ± detail. Bottom of U very faint, and S is slightly visible.

PICKER- 130.3 grains. Stack's 10/84, lot 128 @ \$907. Listed as Good, VF details. Dark with some damage. Half of US faint. Legends mostly complete and eye shows.

ROBISON- Stack's 2/82, lot97 @ \$1250. Listed as VG, probably F-VF. Earlier appeared in Merkin 10/72, lot 500 @ \$3100. Small clip after NOVA. Weakly struck obverse between legends, reverse weak vertically down through date which is very weak. US not visible.

OECHSNER- Stacks 9/88, lot 1002, 94.4 grains, listed as fair, fine details with ITIA, date, LIB, wreath above date, few stars below NOVA prominent. US not visible.



Fig. 1: Tony Carlotto's specimen of the 1786 Nova Constellatio; previously slabbed by PCGS as a 1783 Nova.

Fall, 1998

R.WIDOK- Obverse mostly weak with NO and LLATIO showing. Reverse has very strong date, LIBERTAS ET and IA strong. Small clip to right of NOVA. Horizontally weak on center of reverse. US not visible. Not previously plated.

A. PIETRI/CROSBY PLATE COIN- 98.8 grains. Appleton, Stacks 3/73 Massachusetts Historical Society lot 82, Roper lot 208, graded as Fine. Don Mituzas, to Angel Pietri. Plated in Stack's 3/73 and 12/83. \$4200 in 73 and \$770 in 83. Also in Stack's 5/89 @ \$935.

Denticle-like mark below NO of NOVA. Clip above CO obverse. Apparent cutter's lip at K-5 of reverse. US very faint.

NEWPORT BEACH SALE, by Dana Linnett, 6/88. Fine or better areas shown, but overall Good. Several obverse digs vertical from L of CONSTELLATIO down to center. U of US very faint.

BOWERS' FUN sale. 1994. lot 1556. Later in Rosa Americana list. - 109.6 grains. Good plus @ \$2599. NOVA CONSTE ET are bold, date, which is sharp, has dig at 17, small clip left of NOVA on the obverse. Double or triple struck, extra B in LIBERTAS. US not visible. Not known to be previously plated.

C.YOUNG- 104.5 grains. Date and legends on both sides complete and moderately visible. Small clip above CO on obverse. US very faint. Cherried, not previously plated.

LAUDER- Poor, tops of ATIO and weak date only detail visible. Wm. Doyle Galleries sale of 12/83, later in Mann-Smedley, Bowers, 9/88. No apparent clip. US not visible.

Which or where is Bushnell coin?



Wanted to buy, Machins Mills Coppers!
Varieties: Vlack 4-71C, 9-76B small date, 13-87CT in any grade.
Please call, write, or ship with price desired.

E-mail: vermont@ix.netcom.com

U.S. COMMUNION TOKENS WANTED: Early American and Canadian issues. Collections or single pieces. Also need Communion token literature, especially the Cresswell book.

WANTED: I am buying colonial paper in lows grades, pin notes, sewn together currency, and other era related paper issues of interest. Also wanted: All New Jersey St. Patrick's coinage for my personal collection. If you have other Red Book colonial duplicates for sale, please write me with price, grade and variety. Thank you.

Send to: Walter Deleu- C4

Fall, 1998


Desperately Wanted:

Choice Mint State Red Book Type Colonials! Getz Silver & Copper Washington Pieces, Silver Myddelton Tokens (with/without box), Gem Mint state Pillar dollars. Rarity-7 and Rarity-8 Connecticut's. Also: all early (pre 1835) US gold- especially rare dates and die varieties.

Contact Dave Wnuck at:
Coin Rarities of New England
1231-B East Main Street, #228
Meriden, CT 06450-1019
Fax #203-271-2476
Call toll free any time: 800-COINS-99



Offering free price lists of British 18th and 19th century tokens, including evasion coppers. Price lists are available by regular mail or by e-mail.

Simon Cordova

e-mail: sicordova@aol.com



Fourth C4 Convention

Make your plans now!

November 19-22

Radisson Hotel

Boston, Massachusetts

Help make it another
great success.

We would like to
see as many of you
there as possible.

Fall, 1998

Coin Photos

Please bring your important coins to the convention to photograph for our photofile. We are particularly interested in your R-5 or higher state coppers and type coins, and any coin you feel could be near the condition census level for the variety.

I am also interested in your Castorland pieces from original dies, to photograph the coin and the edges, and any large head Nova Eborac pieces.

I will have my camera set up at the club table. Look for me there.





Since 1935, the name *Stack's* has been linked to building great collections of colonial coins. Today's collectors take pride in owning colonials pedigreed to such great collections as Oechsner, Hessberg, Groves, Park, Robison, Eliasberg, Spiro, and Picker, to name just a few. We helped build each one of them. *Stack's* can help you build your own collection of colonials, be they coins or medals.

We maintain a comprehensive stock of colonial coins and medals. Need a type, or a particular variety? Call our retail sales department, *Stack's* can help you find what you're looking for. We can help you upgrade, we'll even take your duplicate in trade towards the price of your new purchase.

Thinking of selling your coins? We're always interested in buying colonials. Thinking about an auction for your coins? *Stack's* has conducted more auctions of colonials than all our competitors, combined, ever have. Just give us a call, we'll be glad to help with your plans.

Stack's has the expertise in colonials. *Stack's* research library is the best in the coin business. *Stack's* clientele is the finest in the hobby. We're here to help. Just put us to the test.

Send for a free color booklet about our firm and its history in American numismatics.

Look for us on the World Wide Web at [HTTP://WWW.STACKS.COM](http://WWW.STACKS.COM)



Stack's®



123 WEST 57th STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10019-2280

Telephone (212) 582-2580

FAX (212) 245-5018 or (212) 582-1946

